

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion



VOL. VIII, No. 12

JULY 5, 1948

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

Implications of the New Conception of "Separation"

IN this issue we publish a statement about the problem of Church and State, the first statement endorsed by many Protestant leaders, which we have seen, calling attention to the dangerous implications in the doctrine of separation of Church and State which is now being rapidly developed by the Supreme Court. Protestants have been so pre-occupied with the Roman Catholic problem that they have failed to develop a constructive position of their own on this subject, except for those who are willing to accept the Supreme Court's interpretation of the first amendment as a sound view of the relation between Church and State. We want to make it clear that this statement does not commit any of the sponsors of this journal who have not signed it.

The signers of the statement are right in seeing that the Supreme Court extended the meaning of the original conception of "separation" in a most fateful way when it moved from the mere prohibition of an establishment of religion to the exclusion of all cooperation between the State and the various religious bodies even when such cooperation does not give any of them an advantage over others. We can put what has happened in a different way: as a nation we are moving from the idea that the State should be neutral as between the churches or religious faiths to the idea that the State should be neutral as between all positive forms of religion on the one side and an aggressive secularism on the other. We have drifted into this new position in spite of the fact that it goes against our national heritage. The logic of this new position would destroy all types of cooperation between Church and State which the American people have long taken for granted from the military chaplaincy to tax exemption for church property. Each form of cooperation should be dealt with on its own merits and not eliminated in advance by an *a priori* dogma of separation. How can we explain the fact that

we have somewhat ironically engraved on our coins "In God We Trust"? In the past, it was assumed that those words like Thanksgiving Day and Lincoln's Second Inaugural were not sectarian and hence they represented that body of convictions which could be suitably expressed in the name of the State. All these things belong to the background of thought and attitude which made it possible for the Supreme Court in an earlier day to say that America is a Christian nation. We may see pretension and irony in any such claim but that is to take it in the wrong way. It does not mean that our behavior as a nation is Christian. It does mean that, as a nation, we should recognize that Christian standards have a claim upon us and that as a nation we need the guidance and the power that come from God through Christ. Because of the place of the Jewish faith in American life, it is necessary to express what is true in this conception of the religious heritage and responsibility of our nation more broadly without cancelling the fundamental idea that, for the vast majority of our people, any sense of our standing under God's judgment and mercy as a nation must be expressed in Christian terms or, in effect, denied.

This new form of the doctrine of separation tends in practice to give an advantage to aggressive secularism. The one common form of aggressive secularism, as has been emphasized in this journal, is the tendency to make the institutions and assumptions of American democracy into a religious faith or into a substitute for religious faith. Under the Supreme Court's definition of "separation" this kind of teaching about democracy as a self-sufficient philosophy of life, because it is not given a religious label will quite readily find its place in the ethos and curriculum of our public schools, but when any effort is made to counteract it by positive religious teaching, such teaching is likely to be called sec-

tarian and to fall under the Constitutional ban. It does not appear on the surface that a secular philosophy of life of this kind is itself a faith by which men live and that it is sectarian in the sense that it is partisan and exclusive of other faiths. So, gradually we may find ourselves a nation in which the conviction-forming agencies of all sorts which are

aided by the State will count against rather than for religious faith. That would be the opposite of the intention of many who have contributed to the result, including those Protestants who fail to discern the full meaning of the current interpretation of the Constitution.

J. C. B.

Statement on Church and State

RECENT decisions of the Supreme Court have extended the meaning of the constitutional prohibition of an establishment of religion so that any action by the State that is intended to benefit all religious bodies without discrimination is forbidden. This development of the conception of separation of Church and State seems to us to be unwarranted by the language of the first amendment and to bring about a situation in which forms of cooperation between Church and State that have been taken for granted by the American people will be endangered. We believe that, whatever its intention may be, this hardening of the idea of "separation" by the Court will greatly accelerate the trend toward the secularization of our culture. We favor the separation of Church and State in the sense which we believe to have been intended in the first amendment. This prohibited the State from giving any Church or religious body a favored position, and from controlling the religious institutions of the nation. We contend that Jefferson's oft quoted words, "wall of separation," which are not in the Constitution but which are used by the Court in the interpretation of the Constitution, are a misleading metaphor. Cooperation, entered into freely by the State and Church and involving no special privilege to any Church and no threat to the religious liberty of any citizen, should be permitted. As Protestants we desire to affirm this interpretation of the American doctrine of separation of Church and State, and to protest against the interpretation that has been formulated by the Supreme Court.

The situation created by these decisions of our highest Court makes clear that it is important for our great religious communions, without obscuring their differences of faith and policy, to explore the possibilities of working together. Only as we realize such possibilities shall we succeed in maintaining the religious foundations of our national life.

Bishop James C. Baker
Mr. Eugene E. Barnett
Prof. John Coleman Bennett
Mr. John Crosby Brown
Prof. Robert L. Calhoun
Rt. Rev. Angus Dun
Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick
Dr. Charles W. Gilkey
Dr. Douglas Horton
Prof. Walter M. Horton
Dr. Lynn Harold Hough
Dr. Umphrey Lee
Dr. Henry Smith Leiper
Bishop Francis J. McConnell
Dr. Benjamin E. Mays
Mr. Francis P. Miller
Prof. H. Richard Niebuhr
Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr
Prof. Justin Wroe Nixon
Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons
Mr. Andrew H. Phelps
Prof. Liston Pope
Hon. Francis B. Sayre
Rt. Rev. William Scarlett
Prof. H. Shelton Smith
Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen
Mr. Charles T. White

Save the United Nations*

SUMNER WELLES

WE Americans believed when the victory of the Second World War had at last been won that we would see the establishment of a new world order under which the liberty of all nations and the freedom of all individuals would be consecrated, under which general economic security could be advanced, and under which peace would be maintained.

That aspiration was shared by peoples throughout the world. That was the hope which had given courage and renewed strength to millions of men and women during the years of trial and of misery through which they were forced to pass. The realization of that ideal was indeed all that could in any sense atone for the suffering that humanity had undergone, or even remotely compensate for the countless lives that had been lost in the Second World War.

Barely three years ago at San Francisco, as a result of the unflinching determination of Franklin Roosevelt, the nations of the world joined in creating the agency through which we believed those hopes could at length be realized. In recent months that agency, the United Nations, has seemed to be disintegrating before our very eyes. It has rapidly lost the confidence of the masses of the people. Its very name is becoming a symbol of inadequacy. Its authority is being flagrantly flouted at this very moment by some of the weakest and most backward of the nations of the earth.

America's Challenge

We Americans do not yet seem to realize that what is taking place is a direct challenge to us. We appear to be obsessed with that strange delusion that the United Nations is something that is altogether divorced from the national life of the peoples of the world, and that national policies, and particularly the national policy of our own Government, have had no part in causing the rapid and progressive decline of the United Nations that we now witness. Many of our fellow citizens seem in fact to take peculiar pleasure in terming the United Nations "a flop." They apparently are unwilling or unable to see that during this initial stage of its life, the United Nations can be no more than what the major powers are willing to make of it. They are equally unable or unwilling to see that American policy is very largely responsible for the failure at which they scoff.

Unless the people of the United States recognize realistically how urgent the moment has become, how imperatively remedial action is required, and what the real causes for this collapse of the United Nations actually are, we Americans are going to lose this last best chance of achieving a durable and peaceful world order through the United Nations.

Winston Churchill likes to call the Second World War the "Unnecessary War." No term could be more accurate. I wish it were in current use. For it was a war that was brought on solely because of the incapacity and stupidity of the so-called statesmen to whom the peoples of Western Europe had entrusted the determination of their destinies during the two decades after the Treaty of Versailles was signed. It was brought on because of the persistent effort of the major powers of Western Europe to employ the League of Nations as an instrument to advance, not the welfare of the community of nations, but rather, their own immediate interests. It was brought on above all else because the governments of the democratic peoples refused to see that the security and welfare of each people can only be safeguarded if the security and welfare of all peoples are assured. We are failing to learn from those lessons of the immediate past.

Selfish Interests—the Cause of Past Failure

The true reasons for this tragic failure of the United Nations is that both the United States and the Soviet Union have so far attempted to make of the United Nations an instrument to advance their own individual and selfish interests, and have failed to make of it that ever stronger foundation for collective security which it must become if those objectives written into its Charter are ever to be attained, and if mankind is to be spared the final calamity of a new world war.

Solely because it believes that it can thereby further the policy of aggressive expansion and of world domination upon which it has embarked, the Soviet Government has during these past three years exercised its veto right in the Security Council twenty-five times. It has used this right to prevent any impartial investigation of the origins of that form of foreign aggression which the people of Greece have been facing since the end of the war, and to impede the United Nations from fulfilling its obligation to safeguard the independence and integrity of the Greek nation; it has used this right to prevent the United Nations from reaching any objective determination of the nature of the developments that brought about two months ago the annihilation of

* The substance of this article by Mr. Welles was given in an address before a dinner of the American Association for the United Nations and is published with his permission.

freedom and of democracy in Czechoslovakia; and it has even used this right to prevent the entrance into the United Nations of such countries as Eire, Italy and Portugal, merely because the inclusion of these free countries would not favor the interests of the Soviet dictatorship.

This exercise by the Soviet Union of its veto right has all but crippled the Security Council. The Soviet Government has also prevented the United Nations from reaching that agreement for the control of atomic energy which is imperative if civilization is to be preserved. It has prevented the United Nations from establishing any international police force, although the authority of the United Nations must necessarily remain but a shadow until it possesses a police power by which its decisions can be enforced.

The Soviet Government, far from attempting to build up the United Nations as the one effective agency through which collective security, and thereby the individual security of the Russian people, could be safeguarded, has persisted in seeking to employ this great latent world force as a means of advancing what it so short-sightedly regards as the true interests of Russia.

It would be well if we Americans, when we justly assail the wrecking course that the Soviet Union has pursued within the United Nations, could ourselves speak with a clear conscience, and with the assurance that the United Nations had been—as our present Government has so often told us it was—the foundation of our foreign policy. Unfortunately, time and again, the action taken by the United States during these past two years has been taken in utter disregard of the vital interests of the United Nations. It has in no few instances gravely impaired the strength, the authority and prestige of the world organization. In no instance has this been more the case than in our national policy toward Palestine.

American Policy in the Partition of Palestine

In these moments of tragic crisis in the Holy Land every American should ask himself these two questions. Can our Government's policies be justified on the ground of national security? Have these policies strengthened the United Nations, and thereby made it more probable that the welfare and the safety of the American people can be insured under a free and peaceful world order?

When the United States last February totally reversed its previous policy and refused any longer to support the plan for partition with economic union adopted by the Assembly on November 29, 1947, we were given to understand that this reversal was due to reasons of national security. Stripped of all euphemism this meant that the influences in Washington then determining our policies maintained that

by abandoning partition we could better block Soviet expansion into the Eastern Mediterranean and into the Near East, continue to have access to the oil resources of that region, and obtain the loyal support of the Arab states for the Western Powers against the Soviet Union.

Our defense authorities held that if the United Nations was compelled to use force to implement the Partition Plan the Soviet Union would have insisted upon sending Russian troops to Palestine, and that in that event further Soviet expansion into Arabia and into the Mediterranean would become a certainty. Yet had the United States taken the leadership last November, after the adoption of the Partition Plan, in urging upon the Security Council the need to create a United Nations constabulary to keep the peace in Palestine, composed of contingents from the smaller powers that had no direct interest in Palestine, there would then have been no question of the participation of Russia or of any other great power in such a constabulary. The surest way of bringing Russian military force into the picture was to stand aloof and to do nothing while the fires of hostility and of aggression flamed ever higher in Palestine. And that is precisely what the United States did.

Should the present tension between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers result in hostilities, how can this Government assume that the United States or any other Western Power could still have access to the oil of the Near East? It is equally unrealistic to assert that Arab governments which chiefly depend upon the revenues they derive from their oil concessions would cancel the concessions now held by Western interests, and thus voluntarily deprive themselves of these indispensable revenues, when no other way of cashing in on their oil resources is open to them.

The assumption of our policy makers that by abandoning partition they could win the loyal support of the Arab world for the West is no less ludicrous. If the history of the past three decades shows anything, it shows that the Arab leaders have invariably served whatever cause they believed would best advance their own interests. Surely it is today hardly necessary to point out that during the last war Arab support for the Axis was predominant until the victory of the Allied powers had become imminent.

By using all of our influence until the last moment to prevent the establishment of an independent Jewish state in Palestine we, on the contrary, impeded the creation of the one Near Eastern state that must inevitably be a true democracy—a democracy that because of self-interest, as well as because of the manner of being of its people, must unquestionably be ever an unswerving supporter of the Western cause.

Need for Consistent Foreign Policy

In any appraisal that we Americans make of the effects of the Palestine policy upon our national security it must ever be remembered that security is not only a question of economic or military considerations. There are other considerations that, while less tangible, must be equally taken into account. The security of this nation will always be advanced if other governments and other peoples are certain that the United States pursues a consistent foreign policy upon which they can count, and that it does not waver on its commitments, even though those commitments may seem to involve new hazards and new burdens.

There was never a moment in our history when the confidence of other peoples in the dependability of the United States represented a more vital element of our national security.

The extent of the damage done to our national security by our Government's policy toward Palestine has only been exceeded by the harm that it has occasioned to the authority and prestige of the United Nations.

The peoples of the democracies saw last November that the Assembly had by a substantial majority agreed upon a fair and practicable settlement for one of the most controversial problems of modern times. They saw that the Soviet Union and the United States both supported the agreement reached.

What was then more than ever necessary was that popular confidence in the United Nations, and international respect for its authority, be revised by a concrete demonstration that the United Nations could work, and that it had the power needed to make its will prevail. A successful implementation of the Palestine plan would have heartened peoples in every part of the world. It would have done much to rally support for the United Nations at a critical moment in its existence.

Yet it was at that very moment that the United States not only failed to assume enlightened leadership in order to make sure that the Partition Plan would be carried out, not only abandoned the Partition Plan and proposed in its stead a trusteeship project that must inevitably have prevented the creation of the independent State of Israel that we now see, but also insisted upon a restrictive interpretation of the powers of the Security Council which could only render the Security Council impotent to enforce its will in order to settle the problems and the controversies that make for war before war actually breaks out.

State of Israel

As Americans we cannot fail to recognize that our Government's policy toward Palestine has been devoid of vision and principle. It has even been devoid of any realistic conception of where this nation's true interests lie.

True, we have now recognized the State of Israel. But the establishment of that independent state was until the last moment impeded by American policy, and it was only achieved by the amazing devotion and by the superb courage of the Jewish people themselves.

True, the United States is today attempting, within the United Nations, to find a way by which the aggression of the Arab states against Israel may now, at last, be halted. But for many months we never even admitted that such notorious aggression in fact existed, and by our Arms Embargo we have made it infinitely more difficult for the Jewish people of Palestine to defend themselves.

True, we have now welcomed to Washington as this nation's official guest that great patriot and that great statesman, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the first President of Israel. But the words of welcome and of official recognition with which he has been greeted can never atone for the lives that have been lost in Palestine in consequence of the vacillations and of the devious nature of this Government's policy.

I know of no chapter in the history of American foreign policy for which we Americans have more just reason to be ashamed.

Is the United Nations Failing?

It is because of such blows at the structure of the United Nations delivered by the United States and by the Soviet Union, and to a lesser extent by certain other countries, that popular confidence in the efficacy of the world organization, and in its capacity eventually to meet the responsibilities with which it is charged, has now fallen to so low a point.

The average citizen only sees that the United Nations is failing. He rarely asks himself why it is failing. He consequently does not understand that the basic trouble is not with the Charter itself, but with the way in which the major powers are dealing with the United Nations.

We Americans in particular are an impatient people. We are all too apt to believe that, unless a policy upon which we have embarked quickly shows successful results, we had better abandon it and try something else. We all too often are inclined to rest upon our oars before the race is won.

It is, therefore, not surprising that it should be here in the United States that so many movements are already under way designed to persuade the people of the United States that the United Nations should be scrapped and something else tried in its stead before the United Nations has even had time to prove itself.

Some are clamoring that our Government should call an international conference to draw up a new charter, although under present world conditions no charter even half so liberal or so effective as the existing Charter could possibly be agreed upon.

We are confronted with ready-made constitutions for a world government adapted perhaps to some Utopia, where all of the peoples of the earth possess the same high standards of living, the same degree of literacy, and the same measure of experience in their capacity for self-government, as those possessed by the people of the United States.

Resolutions are introduced in the Congress intended to bring about the immediate amendment of the United Nations Charter so as to provide for the elimination of the veto, although the authors of these resolutions apparently forget that the Congress itself would never have ratified the present Charter unless the United States had been accorded precisely that veto right which it is now desired to eliminate.

The real objective of a majority of all of these proposals is the expulsion of the Soviet Union and its present satellites from the United Nations. Should this Government ever lend itself to such a purpose it is my profound conviction that it would thereby help to destroy for many generations to come whatever chances there may still be for the establishment of a universal world order, and inevitably divide the world into two armed and hostile camps between which war must sooner or later break out.

The Answer to the Challenge

I am not one of those who still believe that there is some prospect for a rapid settlement of the basic differences between the East and the West. I fear that the contest in which we are now engaged will prove to be long. I do not believe that it will be ended until the Government of the Soviet Union at last convinces itself that the unity of the West cannot be shattered, that the force and the material resources of the Western Powers are superior, or at least equivalent, to those at the disposal of the Soviet Union, and that consequently the risk of any war with the United States now or later would be too great to make it permissible.

If the United States and the other democracies are to win in such a protracted contest we Americans must be prepared to undergo material sacrifices and to show a measure of persistence, of tenacity, and of capacity in the handling of our foreign relations that we have never heretofore been called upon to demonstrate.

Will we be more likely to succeed in that contest, and to enjoy thereafter that peaceful, free and prosperous world order that we claim is our objective, by now transforming the United Nations into a mere military alliance directed against the Soviet Union, or will we be more likely to succeed through a persistent and intelligent effort to maintain the United Nations as a universal organization in which Russia and her satellites can eventually play their full part?

Which of these two alternatives will be better calculated to convince the Russian people that it would be far less hazardous for them to obtain safety, and the advancement of their legitimate interests, through full cooperation within the United Nations, rather than through continued insistence upon unilateral action and aggressive expansion?

No, the ills that we are now seeking to cure can only be cured by making of the United Nations the foundation in fact, and not in mere empty words, of the national policy of the United States, by lending the world organization the full force of our own national authority, and by trying whenever that may be possible to use and to expand those facilities within the present Charter of the United Nations in such a way as to promote the individual safety of each member state and the great cause of collective security.

Long strides ahead have already been taken in that direction. The organization of the American Republics recently elaborated at the Conference of Bogota is one. The understandings reached between Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, and the arrangements entered into by the sixteen nations of Western Europe are others. Such constructive proposals as that recently introduced in our Senate by Senator Vandenberg, or the draft treaty, based upon Article 51 of the Charter which recognizes the right of individual or collective self-defense if the Security Council is prevented from discharging its obligations, suggested by the American Association for the United Nations, are equally destined under present world conditions to make for a more efficient and for a far stronger world organization until the day comes when the wide differences between the Soviet Union and the United States can at length be justly resolved.

ROME: Vatican to Have Official Observer At Amsterdam Assembly

The Vatican will send an official observer to the first assembly of the World Council of Churches, which opens in Amsterdam, Holland, on August 22, officials of the Holy See announced. Also attending the Amsterdam meeting will be "a few priests" who have been given special permission to "listen in" at the international church gathering.

The announcement was made following the issuance of a warning by the Congregation of the Holy Office that Catholic clergymen and laymen may not participate in "mixed" congresses or meetings of Catholics and non-Catholics in which matters of faith are discussed.

Officials stressed that Catholics designated or permitted to attend the Amsterdam meetings are in no sense to be regarded as official representatives of the Catholic Church, but will be present solely to observe the proceedings.

R. N. S.

The World Church: News and Notes

Delegates Begin Intensive Preparation for Amsterdam

The English edition of the first three volumes of study material for the Assembly of the World Council of Churches has just been sent to the various participants of the Assembly by the Study Department of the World Council. The French and German editions will follow soon. Each of these participants will receive the volumes which the section to which he has been assigned will discuss.

"The Universal Church in God's design" is the subject of volume one. Bishop Gustaf Aulen of Sweden served as Chairman of the study group which prepared the material, Prof. Clarence T. Craig of Yale Divinity School, as Vice-Chairman, and the Rev. Oliver S. Tomkins, London, as secretary and editor.

The second volume deals with "The Church's Witness and God's Design." The Director of the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, Professor Hendrik Kraemer was Chairman, and Bishop Stephen Neill, co-Director of the Study Department, was secretary of the group which dealt with this subject.

In the third volume on "The Church and the Disorder of Society" we have the materials prepared by a group under the direction of Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr, of New York. Dr. J. H. Oldham, of London, served as Vice-Chairman, and the Rev. Nils Ehrenström, Director of the Study Department, was secretary.

The chapters of these three volumes have been written by approximately forty different men and women, but at least two hundred have assisted in the preparation of these materials. It should be noted that the chapters are not produced by any one professional group, rather are they the product of men and women from various professions and from many different churches and countries.

The fourth volume which deals with "The Church and the International Disorder" will be ready for distribution early in July.

E. P. S., Geneva.

GENEVA: 142 Church Bodies to Be Represented at Amsterdam

A total of 142 church bodies in 42 countries will be represented at the first assembly of the World Council of Churches, to be held in Amsterdam, Holland, from August 22 to September 5, according to World Council headquarters.

World Council officials disclosed that Russia is the only major nation still unrepresented by churches in the Council. It was said Council leaders had invited the Church of Russia into membership, but no final decision has as yet been taken by the Moscow Patriarchate. Also, no definite word about their eventual participation has yet been received by World Council headquarters from the Orthodox Churches in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Romania.

(A Sofia dispatch to Religious News Service said the Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church has decided not to participate in the Amsterdam assembly.)

It is believed that a conference of the Orthodox Churches called by the Moscow Patriarch in the Russian capital beginning July 7 will discuss what attitude Eastern Orthodox Churches taking part in the Moscow conference should take toward the World Council.

From Poland, names of two delegates have been received who will represent the Evangelical Church of the Augsburgian Confession (Lutheran). The Polish National Church, also a World Council member, has not yet forwarded the names of the two delegates it is entitled to send.

Three church bodies in Czechoslovakia have joined the World Council and have reported the names of their delegates.

R. N. S.

CANADA: Clergyman Barred from Entry into U. S.

The Rev. G. Harvey Forster, an official delegate of the United Church of Canada to the forthcoming Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam, was removed from a train at Niagara Falls, N. Y., and refused permission to enter the U. S. He had been enroute to New York where he was scheduled to sail for Europe.

Forster, considered a leftist, subsequently went to Montreal where he boarded a plane for London. He was accompanied by his wife.

The fact that he possesses a visa to Russia was thought to have been a reason why U. S. immigration officers took him off the train. He carried a letter of greeting to the patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church from the United Church, and similar messages addressed to the Reformed Church of Hungary, Romania and Czechoslovakia, and the Evangelical Church of Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Bukovina, the Old Catholic Church of Yugoslavia and the Waldensian Church of Italy.

It was said that Forster's position as superintendent of All Peoples' Missions for the United Church in the Niagara district brought him into contact with many peoples from those European countries.

S. J. McDonnell, acting district director of the U. S. Immigration and Nationalization Service at Buffalo, N. Y., said Forster had been "temporarily excluded because his entry might be deemed prejudicial to the interests of the United States."

Some of Forster's Toronto friends were outspoken on the matter. "Harvey Forster is not a Communist," said the Rev. J. M. Finlay, of Carlton Street United Church. "He has a fine, philosophical mind, has done some fine writing, and no Communist would pull the wool over his eyes. But the incident just shows how ridiculous this Red-hunting can become when anybody who is a humanitarian can be labelled as Red."

"Dr. Forster is definitely not a Communist, though he leans to the left," said Dr. A. J. Wilson, editor of the United Church Observer."

R. N. S.

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| JOHN C. BENNETT | LISTON POPE |
| F. ERNEST JOHNSON | HENRY P. VAN DUSEN |
| GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Secretary</i> | |

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| JAMES C. BAKER | HENRY SMITH LEIPER |
| HENRY SLOANE COFFIN | JOHN A. MACKAY |
| CHARLES W. GILKEY | RHODA E. MCCULLOCH |
| LYNN HAROLD HOUGH | FRANCIS P. MILLER |
| UMPHREY LEE | EDWARD L. PARSONS |
| HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS | |

LONDON: Archbishop of Canterbury Wins Fight to Retain Death Penalty

Dr. Geoffrey Francis Fisher, Archbishop of Canterbury, was credited with a leading part in persuading the House of Lords to reject by 181 to 21 votes the clause of the government's Criminal Justice Bill providing for abolition of capital punishment for a five-year trial period.

Admitting he felt a "profound uneasiness" about the death penalty, Dr. Fisher nevertheless argued for its retention for certain offences, including the slaying of a policeman. His attitude was very different from that of his predecessor, the late Dr. William Temple, who was a firm abolitionist.

One of the leading opponents of the death penalty was the Rt. Rev. George K. A. Bell, Anglican Bishop

of Chichester, who assailed capital punishment as "an unnecessary violation of the principle of the sanctity of human life" and as "open to grave objections on moral grounds."

The government bill will now go back for reconsideration to the House of Commons, which previously voted in favor of abolishing the death penalty.

R. N. S.

MADRID: Spanish Hierarchy to Issue Statement on Protestant Propaganda

A 3,000-word joint statement by the Spanish Catholic hierarchy on Protestant propaganda in Spain will appear in the forthcoming issue of *Ecclesia*, Catholic Action publication. The list of signers is headed by Enrique Cardinal Pla y Deniel, Archbishop of Toledo, and Primate of Spain.

It is understood the statement will demand strict compliance with the law of July 18, 1945, called "Fuero de los Espanoles," which forbids all non-Catholic public religious manifestations in order "to safeguard the religious unity of Spain." The law guarantees, however, the right of non-Catholics to worship in private.

R. N. S.

Statement on the Israeli Government

A spokesman for the Israeli Government issued the following statement on June 1, 1948:

The so-called Christian Union in Jerusalem, which has issued a manifesto regarding damage to religious buildings in the Holy City, is not a neutral body. It is a group of Arab clergymen or clergymen with predominantly Arab congregations, which has completely identified itself with the political aims of the Arab Higher Committee. None of the Protestant churches is associated with this group, nor is the Roman Catholic Church as such.

Many of the benevolent institutions to which the manifesto refers served as British army quarters prior to the termination of the Mandate and were occupied by the Jewish forces upon their evacuation to prevent the Arab military forces from taking them. Others were originally occupied by Arab forces, used as military bases and taken by the Jews as a matter of absolute military necessity.

The new manifesto is a distortion intended to divert attention from the primary fact that it was a foreign Arab army—the British-led and armed Transjordan Arab Legion—which bombed and shelled Jerusalem, not the Jewish defenders of that city. The fact is that Jewish religious institutions suffered the major brunt of the damage and all the synagogues in the Old City were destroyed. Jewish synagogues are also Holy Places.

Author in This Issue

Sumner Welles was formerly Under Secretary of State, and is now President of the American Association for the United Nations.

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-49